

Remarks

Claims 17-20 have been rejected under 35 USC 101 for not specifying a computer readable medium. Claim 17 has been amended to specify a computer readable medium. Claims 18-20 now contain this limitation through their dependency on claim 17. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 101 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 USC 112(2) for not claiming a structure of the apparatus. Independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to include structure. These limitations are shown in Fig. 4 and described in paragraph 0027. Claims 2-7 and 9-13 include these limitations through their dependency on claims 1 and 8, respectively. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112(2) is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by the article ‘Carrier-Sense Protocols for Packet-Switched Smart Antenna Basestations’ (“Sakr”).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every element of any pending claim, as the following analysis shows.

Independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 17 each recite, in various phrasing, that a device transmits to a base station, and then monitors for an acknowledgement to that transmission from the base station for a defined period of time, but the defined period of

monitoring for an acknowledgement does not start until the channel is free of transmissions from other devices. Sadr does not disclose or suggest these limitations. Nowhere in the cited paragraphs (page 49, column 1, paragraphs 2-3, and page 48, column 2, paragraph 4) does Sadr describe not monitoring for an acknowledgement from a base station until the channel is free of other transmissions. If this rejection is repeated, Applicants request that the rejection point out which specific portion of each paragraph teaches the period of monitoring, the monitoring activity itself, and the acknowledgement from a base station.

The remaining pending claims each depend from one of claims 1, 8, 14, or 17, respectively, and therefore contain the same limitations not disclosed or suggested by the cited reference.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: September 17, 2007

/John F. Travis/

John F. Travis
Reg. No. 43,203

Attorney Telephone:

(512) 732-3918

Correspondence Address:

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402